

CRIME & DISORDER OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY, 4 FEBRUARY 2016

PRESENT: Councillors David Hilton (Chairman), John Story (Vice-Chairman), John Bowden, Hari Sharma and Lisa Targowska and Malcolm Beer.

Also in attendance: Parish Councillor Pat McDonald (White Waltham Parish Council).

Officers: Tanya Leftwich, Brian Martin, Craig Miller, Claire Gomm, Simon Fletcher, Richard Bunn, Louise Hulse and Alison Alexander.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Werner, Parish Councillor Spike Humphrey (Sunninghill & Ascot Parish Council), Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton (Wraysbury Parish Council) and Superintendent Rai (Thames Valley Police).

It was noted that Councillors John Story and Hashim Bhatti would arrive late.

The Chairman informed everyone present that the meeting was being recorded and would be made available on the RBWM website.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

MINUTES

The Part I minutes of the meeting held on the 24 November 2015 were agreed as a correct record.

YOUTH OFFENDING TEAM OVERVIEW

The YOT Service Manager, Louise Hulse, gave Members a brief presentation on the Youth Offending Team (YOT) and explained how the YOT management could be more effective than it had been. The presentation covered the following areas:

- Modern Youth Justice partnerships: the role of the YOT management board.
- Modern Youth Justice partnerships: responsibilities of the board.
- Characteristics of effective boards.
- Membership.
- Expectations of a draft agenda.

Councillor Beer arrived

- Performance overview: National indicators – end of Q2.
- Finance.
- Asset Plus.
- National review of Youth Justice.

In the ensuing discussion the following points were noted:

- It was important that the YOT management board had sufficient decision making powers.

- That in other Local Authorities the YOT produce an induction pack for the Youth Management Board.
- That the target (0.75) with regard to reoffending which was noted to be on target at 0.52. It was noted that the 0.52 target which was set locally was the average number of re-offences by all youth offenders in a twelve month period.
- That of the 10-17 year olds anyone who was turned 15 years old would not be shown in the re-offending statistics because they would fall outside the time scale.
- That there had been an indication of a 1% cut in the PCC contribution for next year.
- That the number of young people with disposals as a consequence of offences were declining.
- That draft findings of the National Youth Justice Review should be available in February with final findings to be available in June.
- That benchmarking took place in terms of practice and that statistically the Royal Borough was a high performing YOT.
- That if the young person was a resident of the Royal Borough but committed an offence outside the borough then the Thames Valley Police had an obligation to notify the Council within 24 hours of the offence.
- That the YOT had been established in 2000.
- That no data to show the number of offences committed by young people outside the Royal Borough that had been dealt with elsewhere was available.

It was agreed that of the 42 young offenders in the Royal Borough Members would be informed of the number that had re-offended along with the number of re-offences per young person. It was noted that this information would be provided to Members in age bands and gender in order to hide the young peoples identities.

It was also agreed that the local statistics could be collated in a scorecard similar to the one that was produced for the Corporate Parenting Forum (i.e. to show how many had not re-offended, how many had re-offended once, how many had re-offended twice and how many had re-offended three times and above). It was noted that the scorecard would be run past Councillor Lisa Targowska before it was provided to Members of the Panel.

COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP MATTERS

The Community Safety Manager, Brian Martin, gave Members a verbal update on Community Safety Partnership (CSP) matters. It was noted that it was that stage in the year when the Council were looking at the plans for next year and also looking back on what had happened over the last year. Members were informed that a Community Safety report was being produced which looked at emerging trends and established a series of priorities for the coming years which included:

- Sexual assault.
- Violent crime.
- Burglary.
- Safeguarding (crime related).
- Business as usual (including Anti-Social Behaviour).

It was noted that these priorities were all looked at by the following overarching themes:

- Prevention.
- Protection.
- Inclusion.

Members were informed that the Council had a short annual action plan in place and would be refreshing the three year strategic action plan. It was noted that all the above should be available for Members to see at the next meeting in March.

The Community Safety Manager went on to explain that the Council had actively engaged and completed two consultations around Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) and that a meeting had been set up for the 23 March 2016. Members were informed that a paper was being produced for Cabinet on the new type of PSPOs. It was noted that the new type of PSPOs would cover Dog Control, Barbecues and Rough Sleepers in Council run car parks. The borough would also be considering the viability of giving teachers the power to fine people parking in an anti-social manner around schools.

UPDATE FROM THAMES VALLEY POLICE

The Chairman informed Members that Superintendent Rai (Thames Valley Police) was unable to attend the meeting but had provided the Clerk with a copy of the current crime statistics of which a hard copy had been supplied to everyone present at the start of the meeting.

In the ensuing discussion the following points were noted:

- There were 140 public space cameras in the Royal Borough which provided the Thames Valley Police with evidence bundles for crimes such as bike theft.
- That successes were publicised by the Thames Valley Police via social media.
- That the crime statistics covered ten months (financial year to date).
- That theft from cars was being reported through the Alert system and that the majority of crimes were due to cars being left unlocked.

RESOLVED That the Chairman would email Superintendent Rai and request that she provide a report for the next meeting to explain the drivers behind:

- **Violence with injury.**
- **Violence without injury.**
- **Rape (whether there had been an increase in reporting or an increase in offences).**
- **Bike thefts.**
- **Possession of weapons offences.**

NIGHT TIME ECONOMY ENFORCEMENT SERVICES

The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement, Craig Miller, informed Members that the purpose of the report was to consider the results of the six month Night Time Economy Enforcement pilot that concluded on 31 December 2015 and determine whether the service was continued as a permanent arrangement.

It was noted that the performance data and reports had been analysed to inform a recommendation to continue the service as a permanent arrangement using the same configuration as the pilot (Friday & Saturday 19.00 to 03.00).

Members were informed that the report also suggested that a service review was undertaken after a further 12 months (February 2017) to ensure the service configuration continued to offer value for money and was in line with residents' needs and concerns.

The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement explained that the service had been continued on an interim basis since 31 December 2015 and could therefore be made permanent with immediate effect should Members be minded to approve the recommended option. It was noted that the annual cost of operating the service was £7,000 (revenue) and £2,000(capital).

In the ensuing discussion the following points were noted:

- That this could be seen to be a proactive step towards a reactive solution giving greater scope for residents to access services.
- That further work would be done with the Thames Valley Police and night time economy premises.

- That the community wardens would take on more of an enforcement role going forward.
- It was questioned whether some of the environmental protection investigations throughout the trial could have been done throughout the day (i.e. taxi licensing checks and licensed premises checks). The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement explained that licensed premises checks could not be done during daytime hours.
- That the Council received approximately 4500 complaints per annum, the majority of which were noise nuisance related.
- That one of the Councils Manifesto commitments was to increase the number of Community Wardens from 18 to 36 with no increase to resources (e.g. approximately three per year).
- That it could be explored whether night time economy premises (particularly in Windsor) could help manage egress of revellers by utilising their SIA doorstaff .
- That the use of both taxi ranks in Winsor could help reduce issues related to the night time economy.

The Crime & Disorder Overview & Scrutiny Panel unanimously agreed to recommend to Cabinet the following:

- i. Approves Option 1 as detailed in point 2.9 below;**
- ii. Delegates authority to the Strategic Director of Operations in conjunction with the Lead Member for Environmental Services to undertake a service review in 12 months and submit a report to Cabinet should any significant changes to the service configuration be considered necessary;**
- iii. Approves the exploration of options for managing the night time economy with relevant night time economy stakeholders and Thames Valley Police to assist with successful egress from night time economy locations;**
- iv. Delegates authority to the Strategic Director of Operations in conjunction with the Lead Member for Environmental Services to prepare a media statement to communicate and promote the continuation of the Night Time Economy service as a permanent arrangement.**

UPDATE ON THE DRUG AND ALCOHOL ACTION TEAM REVIEW

The Chairman gave Members a verbal update on the progress of the DAAT Task & Finish Groups work.

The Chairman explained that at the meeting on the 27 October 2015 the Panel had been given a presentation on proposals for a full review of the DAAT and that this review would be undertaken by a Task and Finish Group. It was noted that this group was being chaired by Councillor Carroll and included other Councillors, a number of key stakeholders including Dr Kirstin Ostle, GP representing WAM, Inspector Mike Darrah, Thames Valley Police, Dr Lise Llewellyn, Director Public Health Berkshire and a number of Council officers.

Members were informed that the Task & Finish Group terms of reference included:

1. Benchmarking service outcomes.
2. Reviewing best practice.
3. Developing options for future service delivery.
4. Assessing risk of options and mitigation.
5. Consultation on options.
6. Conducting Crime and Disorder and Health Impact Assessments of options.

The Chairman went onto explain that the plan was to formulate options for future service delivery for the consideration of Cabinet.

It was noted that the Chairman had attended many of the Task and Finish meetings and had been impressed not only by the engagement of stakeholders but by the quality and depth of the discussions that had taken place. Members were informed that the process had included meetings with Public Health England, Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust on mental health issues and importantly users of the DAAT service provided by SMART.

The Chairman commended the Public Health Programme Manager & DAAT Manager and Commissioner, Claire Gomm, who headed the DAAT for her dedication in preparing many detailed papers for the Task & Finish group and for her openness and clarity in responding to questions and helping to guide the debate.

The Clerk was asked to minute the Chairman's commendation.

Members were informed that the benchmarking exercise had been completed with the following headlines:

- Overall, in terms of prevalence and complexity factors, the needs of the Royal Borough appeared to be less than those of Slough and Reading, similar to those in West Berkshire but largely higher than those of Wokingham and Bracknell.
- Performance in the Royal Borough around successful completions of adult services users has compared well to the other Berkshire authorities, with the September 2015 data placing RBWM second for the non-opiate and alcohol cohorts and third for the combined alcohol and non-opiate cohort. There were some improvements to be gained in the opiate cohort.
- Performance around 'in treatment' benefits which sought to demonstrate the positive gains experienced before people exited formal treatment showed that RBWM compared well to national averages.
- Finally, the Young People's service was described, as demonstrating the balance of one to one 'treatment' work carried out as well as the prevention work. It was noted that the service performed well compared to the other Berkshire services, with the highest rates of planned exits for young people in service, in 2014/15.
- When considering costs the Borough's budget was the joint third highest in Berkshire. It was noted that the Royal Borough had the third highest estimated drug user population, the third highest number in treatment and the third highest rate of alcohol admissions. The Chairman explained that on balance the Royal Borough compared well with the other Berkshire Unitaries.
- Using the benchmarking information a consultation survey was developed on the SMART and prescribing services with a separate consultation on Young People's services, which seemed to have a greater focus on prevention and questions covered a broad range from stakeholder priorities to measures of success. Members were informed that once the results had been analysed the Task and Finish group would focus on developing options for the service which would be presented to Cabinet.

The Chairman informed the Panel that the Task & Finish Group were next due to meet on the 9 February 2016.

The Chairman went on to explain that Members might be interested to learn Psychoactive Substances Act 2016 would come into force on the 6th April 2016. It was noted that this act was passed to combat what was widely known as legal highs.

In the ensuing discussion the following points were noted:

- That replies to the survey would be chased up by the Public Health Programme Manager & DAAT Manager and Commissioner.
- That the data from service user replies was currently being collated.
- That more could be done with GP's around early intervention for people at risk.

BUDGET 2016/17

The Chief Accountant, Richard Bunn, referred Members to pages 33-200 of the agenda and gave an overview of the Council budget for 2016/17. Members were informed that the report would be going before Cabinet on the 11 February 2016 and then onto Council on the 23 February 2016.

Members were informed that there had been an increase in demand from Adult Social Care and that the Council would lose about 45% of the grant over the next four years. It was noted that the Council was able to raise funds elsewhere locally possibly by raising Council Tax by 4% if it wished. This would be made up of a 2% increase that could be levied without a local referendum and a further 2% adult services precept could be imposed.

The Chief Accountant went on to explain that there was a new homes bonus scheme 2017/18 which meant that no new homes bonus would be received on homes built after the appeal. Members were informed that there were therefore significant changes proposed to the way the new homes bonus scheme currently worked.

In the ensuing discussion the following points were noted:

- The Chief Accountant explained that an injection of £3.8million had been made for the increase in demand from Adult Social Care and £5.7million needed to be made in efficiency savings.
- Members were referred to the capital programme specifically on pages 101, 104, 123 & 134 of the agenda and asked if there were any schemes the Panel wanted to promote.

The Crime & Disorder Overview & Scrutiny Panel unanimously agreed to recommend to Cabinet the following:

- i. That the detailed recommendations contained in Appendix A, which includes a Council Tax at band D of £906.95, be approved.**
- ii. That an Adult Social Care Levy of £1.191m be included in the Council's budget proposals, this levy being equivalent to £18.14 at band D.**
- iii. That Fees and Charges as contained in Appendix B be approved.**
- iv. That the Capital Programme shown in Appendices C and D be adopted by the Council for the year commencing April 2016.**
- v. That responsibility is delegated to the Cabinet Prioritisation Sub Committee to identify specific scheme budgets for the Highway Maintenance programmes as soon as project specifications have been completed.**
- vi. That authority is delegated to the Head of Finance in consultation with the Lead Members for Finance and for Adult Services and Health to add up to a further £300k to the budget for Disabled Facilities Grant once demand for those grants has been established.**
- vii. That the prudential Borrowing limits set out in Appendix L are approved.**
- viii. That Council is asked to note the Business Rate tax base calculation detailed in Appendix P (to follow) and its use in the calculation of the Council Tax Requirement in Appendix A.**
- ix. That the Head of Finance in consultation with Lead Members for Finance and Education, is authorised to amend the Total Schools Budget, to reflect actual Dedicated Schools Grant levels.**
- x. That the Head of Finance in consultation with Lead Members for Finance and Education, the Managing Director and Strategic Director for Adult, Children and Health Services and the School Forum is authorised to approve subsequent allocation of the Schools Budget in accordance with the 2016/17 funding formula and the Schools Finance and Early Years Regulations 2015.**
- xi. That responsibility to include the precept from the Berkshire Fire and Rescue Authority in the overall Council Tax charges is delegated to the**

- Lead Member for Finance and Head of Finance as soon as the precept is announced. (should be 17 February 2016)**
- xii. That the revision to the Council's Minimum Revenue Policy set out in paragraph 3.43 be approved.**

The Panel unanimously agreed that they would like to promote the following Capital Bid schemes:

- Item 15 = Enforcement Services Mobile Phone Replacement 2016-2017.
- Item 16 = Parking Enforcement Equipment Upgrade & Renewal 2016-2017.
- Item 17 = Mobile working for street based staff 2016-2017.

The Panel agreed that Item 53 (Decriminalised parking enforcement (post implementation parking review) be promoted and phased in but that it was not necessarily something that was needed in the short-term or this year.

The Panel stated that in the past the Youth Offending Team had been a separate item in the budget and that in order to be transparent the financial amounts should be split into separate amounts going forward.

DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chairman informed Members that the dates of the next meetings were as follows:

- Thursday 12 April 2016.

Parish Councillor Pat McDonald informed Members that the National Crime Survey was currently taking place and twenty-five houses in Maidenhead were currently being surveyed.

The meeting, which began at 6.15 pm, finished at 8.45 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....